(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

MacNEIL: In economic news, Ivan Boesky, a leading Wall Street takeover specialist, agreed to pay a record $100 million penalty for insider trading abuses. Boesky admitted to using nonpublic information obtained from another trader to earn $50 million in illegal profits. The settlement negotiated by the Securities and Exchange Commission also bars Boesky from the securities business, although he can remain as a personal investor.

And in other economic news, wholesale prices rose a moderate .3% in October, and retail sales plunged by 5%, due almost entirely to a decrease in auto sales after special cut rate financing programs ended. Excluding automobiles, sales showed a slight overall gain in October.

HUNTER-GAULT: Next, we devote most of the News Hour to the fallout over Iran diplomacy, and end with an update on smoking in the workplace.

Fallout

MacNEIL: Our lead focus section tonight: President Reagan's Iran initiative. Will it play in the Persian Gulf, will it play in Paris, and will it play in Peoria? We'll try to get answers to those questions from former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, from the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee Les Aspin and Congressman Henry Hyde of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and finally, with two columnists who've helped frame the Washington debate, Charles Krauthammer and Suzanne Garment. We invited the administration, but they chose not to send anyone. Responding to two weeks of news reports and what he called utterly false charges that the U.S. had traded arms to Iran for U.S. hostages in Lebanon, the President went on national television last night to explain and defend the decision of his administration to renew diplomatic contacts with Iran. Here's how he explained the policy last night.

Pres. REAGAN: For 18 months now, we have had underway a secret diplomatic initiative to Iran. That initiative was undertaken for the simplest and best of reasons. To renew a relationship with the nation of Iran, to bring an honorable end to the bloody six year war between Iran and Iraq, to eliminate state sponsored terrorism and subversion, and to effect the safe return of all hostages. Without Iran's cooperation, we can not bring an end to the Persian Gulf war. Without Iran's concurrence, there can be no enduring peace in the Middle East.

MacNEIL: We go first to Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser. In that job, he had confronted two questions at the heart of the current debate: how best to deal with the Iranians and the role of the national security adviser. He was the first person holding that job to testify before a Congressional committee. He join us tonight from a studio in San Francisco.

Mr. Brzezinski, overall, what was your reaction to the President's explanations last night?

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI, former national security adviser: Well, I must say that I am very sympathetic to his objectives. I think he's right in stressing that the United States needs to open contacts with Iran because of its geopolitical importance. He's right to be concerned about the hostages. He's right to be concerned about helping to end the Iraqi-Iranian war. But having said that, I do feel that the methods used -- the tactics employed -- were too costly and

2022287528 6

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

they got -- when they got caught trying to trade hostages for military equipment. I now believe, having been through enough briefings, having sat through this process, that, in fact, what Henry Hyde is saying is correct -- that their first motive and the main motive, certainly of Bud McFarlane and probably of the whole administration policy here, was that of trying to develop a relationship with the moderates, looking to trying to make sure that we don't have a pro-Soviet government in Iran when Khomeini goes.

HUNTER-GAULT: So you think --

Rep. ASPIN: I think that's right. I think that's right. But I do --

HUNTER-GAULT: So you think this was a proper use, then of the NSC?

Rep. ASPIN: No. Let me just say that --

Rep. HYDE: Proper use of the NSC, she said.

Rep. ASPIN: Yeah, I understand. Let me just first of all say that I think that somewhere along the line, even though they started out on this broader geopolitical track, somewhere along the line they got very heavily involved in the hostage issue, and that there was a swap -- more than one swap. There were several swaps of military equipment for several hostages. And somewhere they started out on the higher plane, but eventually they found themselves dealing with the hostages and straight out making trades.

HUNTER-GAULT: And your answer to the question about this being a proper use of the NSC was no.

Rep. ASPIN: I think the NSC -- it's a tricky thing. I think that the NSC, just -- first of all, I think that any President ought to be able to structure the government to work the way he wants it. Congress, though, has a right to having certain information about that. And the NSC is tricky, because Congress is not -- the NSC is really a staff directly to the President and is not, therefore, answerable to Congress on a day to day basis. So if the President's going to, as a matter of preference, run operations out of the NSC, as opposed to coordinating papers, which is what they do when they coordinate policy, or maybe even occasional secret diplomacy missions. If they're going to actually run operations out of the NSC, I think you're going to find a cry in Congress for more access in terms of hearings, testimony, witnesses coming before Congress from Congress, from the NSC.

HUNTER-GAULT: Just very briefly, Congressman Hyde, because we're going to leave you and come back. So if you could just respond to that briefly.

Rep. HYDE: Yeah, I think that the President uses the tools that are available to him on a very surgical, delicate, sensitive mission -- those that he has the most confidence in, those people that are sympathetic with the program, those people that have personal relationships that are helpful. And if that's the NSC, why, that's fine. If it was the Coast and Geodetic Survey, that would be fine, as far as I'm concerned. Get the job done.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, thank you. Stay there. We'll be back. Robin?

2022875292

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

tactics were simply wrong -- fundamentally unwise.

MacNEIL: You say you applaud the objectives. Did the President convince you with his explanation that the dealings with Iran did have a broader strategic purpose than simply releasing the hostages?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: You know, it's a very dangerous game to try to read people's motives. But if I may speculate, I suspect that, in the case of McFarlane, it was the geopolitical motive that got him involved in this venture. For the President and perhaps for some of his domestic advisers, the plight of the hostages probably was important as well, and perhaps uppermost. In any case, it seems to me that the tangible issue at stake had to be the hostages, because it is difficult to imagine an upgrading of the American-Iranian relationship while the hostages were being held. And here, of course, the question arises, should we have been willing to trickle in arms on a kind of dribbling basis while the Iranians were releasing one hostage after another, but then their allies were taking other people hostage. That seemed to me, again, to be a dubious tactic.

MacNEIL: Did the President, in your view, satisfactorily defend his proposition that he has not violated the principle of trading for hostages -- of giving things in exchange for hostages?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: In my view, I think we all ought to be a little more honest on that subject. I know of no government -- I repeat, no government -- that has been ultimately unwilling to deal over hostages. Even the Israelis have, after all, dealt over hostages and arranged for exchanges. So I think it would have been better if we had made it clear that our policy is that we will not sacrifice vital national interest. We will not sacrifice fundamental principles. But under certain circumstances, we are prepared to deal if some reasonable, even if somewhat unpalatable, swap can be arranged. I think that would have been a better position to adopt than an absolutist, rhetorical stand which we then violate on the QT, so to speak.

MacNEIL: So is the impression left to the world that the United States does deal for hostages now?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: Oh, yes. I think not only is the impression left that we deal with the hostages, but the impression is left that we are being rather hypocritical about it. And I think that is costly as well. This is why I feel that our regional interests were damaged and our overall standing was damaged as well by this particular action.

MacNEIL: Come to the domestic issues in this for a moment, and one that -- in which you have a very relevant experience. Some critics are saying, including some on Capitol Hill, that it is wrong to use the National Security Council as an operational action arm of the executive branch in things like this for clandestine exercises, bypassing the departments -- the cabinet departments and the CIA. What is your view of that?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: I don't entirely agree with that. I think we have to be, again, somewhat more refined in our judgements. Presidents are entitled to conduct their foreign policy as they best see fit in terms of the people they are comfortable with. President Nixon used Mr. Kissinger for secret diplomacy regarding China. And that was, I believe, in the national interest. I have some dealings with foreign governments after the Soviet invasion of

2022875288

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

Afghanistan, again, for the sake of national security. The problem might arise if the National Security Council actually becomes engaged as an institution in the conduct of operations -- but really operations. Here, we are talking really about the President relying on the national security adviser for ad hoc, highly sensitive, occasional negotiating missions. And that I really do not think is improper. On the contrary, it would be an excessive limitation of the President's ability to conduct foreign policy to deprive him of that option if he wishes to exercise it.

MacNEIL: Is this incident going to hamper the President's conduct of foreign policy for his remaining two years?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: If it poisons the well, so to speak, in relations with Congress, if it contributes to a crisis of confidence in him, if it stirs up partisan passions, then I think it will. And this is why I'd just as soon have this incident talked out and put behind us, because it is important for all of us that the President, and particularly the Senate, work together on issues of national security.

MacNEIL: Did he successfully limit the damage last night, do you think?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: I have to say that, much as I wish that he had, I feel that he has not. Because I do not think that he really convinced the country -- he didn't convince me, in any case -- that the issue was dealt with in the best possible manner.

MacNEIL: Mr. Brzezinski, thank you for joining us. Charlayne?

HUNTER-GAULT: Now to Congress, where President Reagan's speech appears to have added new zest to the debate, especially bringing more Republicans more vigorously to the President's defense. Joining us are Les Aspin, a Democrat from Wisconsin and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and also Congressman Henry Hyde, a Republican from Illinois and a member of the House Foreign Affairs and Intelligence Committees. They join us from a studio on Capitol Hill.

Gentlemen, first, let's start with your institutional interests. The President said that the key committees had been informed. Congressman Aspin, were you informed early enough and fully enough?

Rep. LES ASPIN (D) Wisconsin: We were all informed, in fact, only after the issue broke in the press. I think there was nobody on Capitol Hill that was informed before the issue was public.

HUNTER-GAULT: And in your view, that is not proper.

Rep. ASPIN: I think that he made a political mistake. Henry Hyde and I have disagreed, and he may have a case, on the legal point, as to whether there was any legal requirement to inform Congress before this, but I think there's a widespread agreement among all members of Congress that politically, he would have been a lot -- he, meaning the President -- would have been a lot better off, had the circle of people been widened to include at least the leadership on Capitol Hill.

2022875289

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

LEVEL 1 - 48 OF 55 STORIES

Copyright (c) 1986 Educational Broadcasting and GWETA;
The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour

November 14, 1986, Friday Transcript #2905

LENGTH: 9633 words

HEADLINE: Fallout;
Second-Hand Smoke

BYLINE: In New York: ROBERT MacNEIL, Executive Editor; In Washington: CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT, Correspondent; GUESTS: In San Francisco: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI, Former National Security Adviser; In Washington: Rep. LES ASPIN, Democrat, Wisconsin; Rep. HENRY HYDE, Republican, Illinois; CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER, New Republic; SUZANNE GARMENT, Wall Street Journal; REPORTS FROM NEWSHOUR CORRESPONDENTS: ROD STEPHEN (Visnews), in Philippines; ROGER ROSENBLATT; LEE HOCHBERG (KCTS), in Seattle

BODY:
Intro

ROBERT MacNEIL: Good evening. Leading the news this Friday, President Reagan said the country will support him on Iran. In Congress, his speech did not silence criticism of the secret initiative. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Syria for terrorism. We'll have the details in our news summary coming up. Charlayne Hunter-Gault is in Washington tonight. Charlayne?

CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT: The news summary tonight is followed by an extensive look at Iran fallout. We start with the view of former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. Then two congressmen debate the administration's Iran diplomacy. Essayist Roger Rosenblatt weighs in with some words about the principles at stake. We get two opposing media views. And finally, an update on smoking in the workplace.

News summary

MacNEIL: President Reagan said today that most Americans will approve his arms shipments to Iran, but there was continued criticism from Congress, and Iran challenged his account. Iranian President Ali Khameini, speaking in Tehran, did not mention arms shipments, but denied that his government had conducted negotiations to improve relations with the U.S. He said Mr. Reagan's account of negotiations was mere lies, that only Iranian intelligence officers had talked with American officials. In Washington, President Reagan spoke to a White House audience, outlining a policy of firmness and flexibility.

Pres. RONALD REAGAN: We have and will continue to pursue every possible option to remove the causes of terrorism. In short, we will talk when talking is productive and will be firm when firmness is required. But when terrorism does occur, we will act decisively against those who are responsible. There has not been and will not be any ransom for hostages. Let there be no doubt the United States does not pay tribute to terrorists.

MacNEIL: There was criticism of the President's explanations from both Republicans and Democrats in Congress. Republican Senator Pete Wilson of California was critical of the decision to send weapons to Iran, saying, "I

2022875283

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

efforts within the workplace, consideration given to the smokers as well as the nonsmokers. And that's a situation that should be worked out within the individual workplace. We don't think that there should be any type of uniform law restricting the use of tobacco products.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: But legal experts say companies are within their rights to force cigarette smokers outdoors. The constitution prevents states from acting in certain ways, but not private employers.

CORNELIUS PECK, University of Washington: We all admire those wonderful, free spirits who feel so good and happy when they work that they love to whistle while they work, but if the employer decides that that interferes too much with the production in the plant, the employer most certainly may say, "There's no whistling while you work in this plant." They say the same thing about smoking.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: With the law on their side, hundreds of Seattle companies have snuffed out smoking. The Northwest's largest employer, the Boeing Aerospace Company, is gradually imposing a total ban on smoking for its 112,000 workers. At theSeattle Times news room, cigarettes, cigars, pipes have been prohibited ever since these two reporters pushed for a no smoking policy two years ago. They say they were fed up with their colleagues who refused to use desk-top air purifiers provided by the management.

CAROL OSTROM, Seattle Times: You know, I don't want to work -- have to be sick in order to work. I don't think the Times wants me to have to be sick to work either.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: TheTimes says there's no indoor space with adequate ventilation to serve as a smokers lounge. So now Times journalists who smoke have to find another way to work off news room tension, like chewing gum. Or they have to find their way to the fire escape. Here, accompanied by the whir and whine of motors and air compressors, they can enjoy a quick smoke. And smoking on the fire escape can mean braving rain, snow and wind.

RICK RAPHAEL, Seattle Times: In the winter, this is really rough out here. The only salvation for us is this. This is exhaust, and it gets warm, radiates heat, so we stay warm out here.

HOCHBERG: So you huddle close to the chimney here.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Oh, yeah. It's funny. It's really funny, you know. You get out here, and there will be five or six people out here smoking cigarettes, and they're jockeying for space up against the wall to stay warm.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: But, even banished to the fire escape, some smokers see a positive result.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I was smoking two packs of cigarettes a day when I got here. I'm smoking about a pack of cigarettes a day now.

HOCHBERG: So it's helped.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Oh, it's helped. Yeah.

2022875300

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

HUNTER-GAULT: Let me ask you both this: did the President last night persuade you that the United States government was not trading arms for hostages, Congressman Aspin?

Rep. ASPIN: No. This thing smells like a swap, it sounds like a swap, it looks like a swap. I think it's a swap.

HUNTER-GAULT: But the President said there has not been and will not be any ransom to hostages. Is the President lying?

Rep. ASPIN: Well, I can't judge his motives. I mean, I'm not in a position to know what was going through his mind, Bud McFarlane's mind or Poindexter's mind or anybody in the administration's mind at the time. All I can say is that you look at this thing, and the shipments and the release of the hostages was so close together, it couldn't have been a coincidence. Now, they may think there was no quid pro quo. I can't believe that the Iranians didn't think there was any quid pro quo or any outside observer looking at this would think that there was no quid pro quo -- outside observer meaning other people in the Arab states, people in Europe and other countries.

HUNTER-GAULT: Congressman Hyde, were you persuaded that there had not been a deal -- arms for hostages?

Rep. HYDE: There is a superficial plausibility to the fact that there was an even up trade. But I accept the notion that the overriding purpose of this whole adventure was to develop access and influence with some elements inside Iran that are moderate, anti-terrorist, anti-Soviet and pro-solving the war with Iraq. Those are very important, noble motives. And they needed some credibility with other people and with the military within Iran. And this was an offer of bona fides or good faith. Now, the hostage situation, they're not held by these Iranians; they're held by people over whom the Iranians have some influence. Perhaps they weren't able to deliver what we had hoped or what we had expected. They did dribble out some hostages. But I am convinced that the overriding policy goal was to develop and nurture this contact inside Iran, because the direction post-Khomeini that Iran goes might very well forestall World War III. It was risky. No assurances of success. And I agree with Dr. Brzezinski. Maybe he wouldn't have done it. But I think the President did the right thing, and it's not over yet.

HUNTER-GAULT: Do you buy that --

Rep. ASPIN: Can I --

HUNTER-GAULT: Yes.

Rep. ASPIN: Let me say that I think that Henry's right about that.

HUNTER-GAULT: About which?

Rep. ASPIN: This point that their overriding policy objective here was what Mr. Brzezinski called the geopolitical reasons. I did not originally believe that. I originally believed that this idea of improving the relations by developing contacts with moderates in Iran was a cover up -- that they had gone in, and their main objective was the hostages, and that they had come up with this idea of developing relations with the moderates as a cover up to what

2022875291

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

convinced now that it started out as a geopolitical goal, and it ended up as a base political swap. So the only thing that has happened so far, as Charles Krauthammer said, is the swap. And that, of course, is the focus of all the attention. The geopolitical goal may come later. But right now, what we've got is a swap. And I think for that reason, it is very, very damaging. Because what has happened now is something that just has gone totally contrary to what we have been proclaiming publicly, totally contrary to any intelligent way to deal with the hostage situation, and totally contraray to everything that the President has said about the way we will deal with hostages.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, well let me -- let me just go back to Charles Krauthammer, because the other thing -- Suzanne Garment seems like the only person writing today, we've quoted her so much -- but the other thing she did say was -- I'm paraphrasing -- that the press has been hammering away at the administration to do something about the hostages, and then they do something about the hostages, and the press gets upset that they've done the wrong thing. I mean, is it a damned if you do, damned if you don't kind of situation?

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Well, I'm not a defender of the press, and I think those in the press who do say hostages are worth any price are wrong. But if I can make one response to Mr. Hyde, whenever people argue that in relation to the Soviets, we have to be nice, give credits and open trade and make concessions as a way to open an avenue to doves in the Kremlin, Mr. Hyde is the first to jump on it and to call this nonsense. Now we've concocted a scenario in Iran which is exactly identical, with much less evidence of doves, and he's hanging his entire hat in this argument on the theory that, in fact, there are doves whom we are appealing to by trading arms.

Rep. HYDE: Well, Mr. Krauthammer, if I can respond, I don't know how many doves there are. You call them doves. There's a moderate faction in Iran that I'm reliably informed is there and has power and has access, and I think we're crazy not to exploit it. And there are differences between the Soviet Union and Iran, which is going through a transition. But let me just say this: the one plane load -- and we're told these spare parts and other defensive weapons would have fit into one cargo plane, although there were three deliveries -- in no way compares to the $150 million worth of armanents that the Carter administration proposed giving Iran in exchange for our 52 hostages, which never went through. But let's put it in historical context.

HUNTER-GAULT: We don't have a lot of time to put it in historical context, Congressman. I'm sorry. Let me just ask you very briefly, is the President going to be able to win over domestic critics in the United States, you think? Just very briefly, Congressman Aspin, and then Congressman --

Rep. ASPIN: Let me say taht I think that if this were the only thing that had gone wrong, it would be a passing matter. But we're now on a roll, and the President is on a real roll, and it's all going downhill.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, well, we've got --

Rep. ASPIN: We've had Daniloff, we've had the Iceland summit, and now we've got Iran.

Rep. HYDE: And I think the President comes out smelling like a rose on all of them -- especially the Iceland summit, where he told Mr. Gorbachev, "No, we're

2022875298

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

HUNTER-GAULT: But let me just understand you. You're saying that the President did nothing illegal in not --

Rep. ASPIN: I think that is a debatable issue which will be part of the Intelligence Committee's oversight when they go into this in a couple weeks. It's a debatable point on the legal point.

HUNTER-GAULT: Right.

Rep. ASPIN: But I think the political point is not debatable. I think on the political point that it would have been better politically to have included people on the hill -- at least the leadership of both parties and both houses on the hill. I think that is widely agreed to on the hill.

HUNTER-GAULT: Congressman Hyde, is it widely agreed to and do you agree with it?

Rep. HENRY HYDE (R) Illinois: Well, I agree with Les. I think politically it would have been wiser to bring into the circle at the takeoff of this operation the so-called gang of eight. That is, the leaders in the House and the Senate and the leaders on both intelligence committees in the House and the Senate. I understand the administration's reluctance to do that, because we can not keep a secret on Capitol Hill. And lives were at stake -- not only the hostages, but people inside Iran. But nonetheless, I think those eight people could be trusted and ought to have been trusted.And I think bipartisan support would have followed from that, and the political fallout wouldn't be as rough as it is now.

HUNTER-GAULT: Do you agree with that part of it, Congressman Aspin -- that lives were at stake, and therefore, it was understandable that --

Rep. ASPIN: I have a certain amount of sympathy with that position, and clearly, you've got a problem when the more people know something, the more likely it is to get out. In this case, I would have tilted towards the decision to include more people, regardless of that.

Rep. HYDE: If I might add on the legality, I think --

HUNTER-GAULT: Yes, I was about to --

Rep. HYDE: Right. I think Les has highlighted the fact that the law, in my judgement, is deliberately ambiguous. I looked up the debate, and Les participated in it, along with Congressman Boland, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and I think the Constitutional powers of the President were deliberately kept vague in the law -- his right to withhold information for serious, sensitive security reasons -- and nobody really wanted to nail it down. So there's an ambiguity there where both sides have something to argue about.

HUNTER-GAULT: Where do you think they'll come out on this one in the Congress?

Rep. HYDE: I think Congress will insist that it was not treated fairly or honorably or right, and I think the President will disagree, and I will side with the President.

2022875290

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

MacNEIL: And in the public mind?

Ms. GARMENT: Don't know.

MacNEIL: The President sayd today most of the people would side with him on this. What's your hunch on that?

Ms. GARMENT: Just don't know.

MacNEIL: Charles Krauthammer, what is your hunch on whether the public will buy the explanations?

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: I think the public has a tendency to buy whatever the President offers. But our allies in Europe will not buy it. We already heard this evening the comments of the foreign secretary of Britain. And earlier today, Dennis Healy, who's the labor spokesman, found himself attacking Ronald Reagan from the right. I find that's an extraordinary event, and it shows how much this policy, this swap which we've arranged, has undermined our standing on an anti-terrorism policy in Europe.

MacNEIL: Ms. Garment, you also wrote that opponents are using this as an excuse to start trying to roll back Ronald Reagan's foreign policy. Did you mean opponents inside the administration or outside?

Ms. GARMENT: I was talking about outsiders. I hadn't been thinking about insiders in the administration, although, of course, there's been dissension there as well. There's no doubt that there is great political hay to be made out of this, and it's being made.

MacNEIL: Do you think it is going to have a significant, permanent impact on Mr. Reagan's ability to conduct foreign policy for the next two years? Mr. Brzezinski, whom we talked to earlier, though it could well.

Ms. GARMENT: It could.

MacNEIL: If the -- what do you think, Mr. Krauthammer?

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Well, I suspect that this will die down over the next week or two. There will be an attempt in Congress to revive it, but I suspect that that will not succeed. The President has an astonishing ability to remain popular. I think the real damage is going to be abroad and among our friends in the Middle East and in Europe. And that damage, I think, could only be rectified if there was some principled resignation by people in charge, and I don't think that's going to happen.

MacNEIL: Do you think that's the case, Ms. Garment -- that there should be some resignation in order to set this right?

Ms. GARMENT: Well, this was a Presidential decision. There is not much doubt of it. And our system doesn't have much room for Presidential resignations over this sort of thing.

MacNEIL: Right. We'll move on. Charlayne?

2022875296

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

think they should have chosen some other means, like medical supplies." Richard Lugar, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, approved the arms shipments, but said the secrecy was a mistake. Democrat James Exon of Nebraska called the President's actions "morally wrong, a clear case of duplicity." Democrat Patrick Leahy, vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, said the operation sounded amateurish.

Sen. PATRICK LEAHY (D) Vermont: I just think it was a poor policy from word go. I think it got worse because of the attempt of the White House to run this out of a -- pretty much out of a basement office in the White House. I think the State Department and Department of Defense were cut out far too much. It's almost as though the policy was done looking for real short term gains without any consideration of what happens in the long range interests in the Middle East -- ours and the other countries in the Middle East.

MacNEIL: Among U.S. allies, there was oblique criticism. British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe told parliament, "In our view, concessions lead to more, not less, hostage taking." A spokesman for the neo-Gaulist rally in France, the party of Premier Jacques Chirac, told reporters, "Those who give morality lessons would do better to look and sweep their own doorsteps before criticizing others. The French government neither sold nor traded arms to obtain the liberation of hostages." Charlayne?

HUNTER-GAULT: President Reagan imposed more sanctions against Syria today, calling the measures an effort to express our outrage over that country's continuing support for terrorism. The President tightened export controls, terminated availability of export-import bank programs, and ended commercial flights between the two nations. Presidential spokesman Larry Speaks also said that U.S. oil companies have been informed that their continued involvement in Syria was inappropriate. Speaks also said the staff of the U.S. embassy in Damascus will be reduced, and no high level visits between U.S. and Syrian officials will take place. At a State Department briefing, spokesman Charles Redman explained why such steps are necessary.

CHARLES REDMAN, State Department spokesman: We believe further steps must be taken to discourage such Syrian behavior and to express our outrage and that of the American people at Syrian sponsorship of this attack and its long pattern of support for terrorism. We have been in consultation with our allies on this matter, including members of the European Economic Community, who announced their own measures on November 10. We welcome these decisions. These measures and our own actions will send a clear and unequivocal message to Syria. Its support of terrorism is unacceptable to the international community of nations.

HUNTER-GAULT: Syria was also named in a NATO report today that said terrorist attacks will increase and claim more lives in the future. Other countries named were Libya and Iran. The report says they openly endorse terrorism as a means of achieving their policy goals. The report, a draft prepared for the NATO meeting which started today, also criticized Western Europeans in their preference of political measures to fight terrorism.

MacNEIL: The Philippines was gripped by an air of crisis today as President Corazon Aquino vowed to punish the killers of leftist Rolando Olalia, and his followers mounted protests against the man they thought responsible. Rod Stephen of Visnews has a report.

2022875284

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

ROD STEPHEN (voice-over): More than 6,000 demonstrators, incensed by his murder, marched to the headquarters of Defense Minister Enrile. It was peaceful, but the placards told the story. The protestors blamed Enrile. Reports say that the defense minister had Olalia killed because he was too close to Mrs. Aquino and had intended to call a general strike if the military threatened her rule. Only rumors, but enough to worry Enrile, who ordered a force of more than 100 riot police to guard the crowd. The death of Olalia has already been compared to the assassination of Benigno Aquino in 1983, and Mrs. Aquino has set up a commission and offered a reward of $10,000 to anyone who can help the police find the killers.

HUNTER-GAULT: British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher arrived today in the United States for two days of talks with President Reagan.Her plane landed late this afternoon at Andrews Air Force Base outside Washington. She meets with the President tomorrow at Camp David. The talks are expected to cover a wide range of issues, particularly Mrs. Thatcher's concern over President Reagan's long range goal of eliminating ballistic missiles, which she said are necessary to defend Western European countries.

MacNEIL: The U.S. exploded a major nuclear device in the Nevada desert today. It was the 19th announced test since the Soviet moratorium last year and measured 5.6 on the Richter Scale -- one of the highest readings for a nuclear test. In Washington, a Soviet scientist implied the U.S. was cooking the books on its nuclear tests. Vladimir Baranovsky, an official Soviet scientist of Moscow's Academy of Sciences, told a news conference today that the U.S. exploded four more devices than the 19 announced since August, 1985. He also said U.S. testing may cause the Soviets to end their moratorium.

VLADIMIR BARANOVSKY, Soviet scientist (through translator): Today there is supposed to take place the 23rd nuclear test by the United States in the same period that the Soviet Union has not conducted such tests. It is possible to allow the other side to do 10, 20 extra tests, but if we see no signs that the moratorium can become bilateral, then reasons do come up that may force a political reevaluation of the whole situation.

MacNEIL: Baranovsky is a member of a U.S.-Soviet group that disputes the U.S. position that it's not possible to monitor a test ban.U.S. officials say the group is advancing Soviet propaganda.

Speaking of advancement, 1,100 marchers reached the end of a 3,600 mile long trek today. The members of the Great Peace March entered Washington, completing the last 15 miles of a journey begun in Los Angeles more than eight months ago. They plan to hold a rally at the Lincoln Memorial tomorrow. Organizers of the march advocate a nuclear test ban, a bar to all weapons in space, and say they represent 46 states and several foreign countries.

HUNTER-GAULT: President Reagan today signed a bill that creates a no fault compensation system for victims of injuries resulting from childhood vaccinations. The President said he was signing the legislation with what he called mixed feelings. He said he supports provisions of the bill that would allow companies to export drugs not yet approved for use here by the Food and Drug Administration, but he also said he had serious reservations about the compensation package, partly because it would require federal funds.

2022875285

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

consideration.

MacNEIL: You -- Charles Krauthammer, you'd like a comment?

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: If I could make a comment, I remain extremely skeptical about that. Look, last summer, a plane arrives in Tehran bearing arms. And on the day it flies out, Reverend Weir is released in Beirut. And on the next day, the President calls the prime minister of Israel and thanks him. Now, did he thank him for arranging the coincidence? It seems to me quite obvious that what happened is, whatever the motives, what in fact happened was a trade of U.S. national interest against hostages held by kidnappers.

MacNEIL: Ms. Garment, you wrote today in the Wall Street Journal, there is -- I'm paraphrasing you -- there is much less than meets the eye in this whole story. What did you mean by that?

Ms. GARMENT: Simply that what happened in the negotiations -- that is, the attempt to find the opening; the use of the hostages, the use of the arms -- is not -- does not strike me as politically immoral in the way that some commentators have made it look.

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: But I would argue that it's not a question of immorality; it's a question of a sound policy. We have been made the laughing stock of Europe. I mean, any policy which allows the French, who are the masters of cynical diplomacy, to look high minded, I think, is on its face a catastrophe. In this case, I think what's really happened is the administration has mounted what's called in Washington a campaign of spin control to make it look as if this was a grand, strategic design. Where, in fact, it was a primitive hostage swap.

MacNEIL: So you just disagree with the previous speakers that it only became a hostage swap or a hostage release lower down the line. You think it started that way.

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Whatever the motive is or its evolution is irrelevant.What's relevant is what actually happened. What has the United States done? It went abroad berating allies for caving in to terrorism. It went abroad claiming that we have a strong interest in preventing Iran from winning the Iran-Iraq war -- which, in fact, we do. And all the time, it was dealing arms to Iran in the middle of that war in contravention to our policy and to our interest.

MacNEIL: Ms. Garment, you also wrote today at the end of your column words to this effect: that when -- if the administration gets a bit of breathing room now, people are going to start saying it was worth taking -- I don't have your exact words down here -- but it was worth taking a long shot and perhaps losing on it.

Ms. GARMENT: Well, I wrote that taking a long shot was not the worst of crimes, which is a little more guarded.

MacNEIL: Yeah.

Ms. GARMENT: It was a long shot. And for the moment, they seem to have lost. The damage is very real. But I suspect that there may be less shock and outrage among our allies than among our journalists.

2022875295

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

too risky. That's my bottom line.

MacNEIL: Well, let's take those, then. How costly, first of all?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: Well, very costly, I think, first of all, in the region, because the United States has a stake in a good relationship with the moderate Arab states. It has a stake in not being perceived as in some way helpful to Iran's conduct of the war against Iraq. And the shipment of even limited defense oriented items destroys any pretense of American non-involvement. It creates the false impression of America, in fact, helping Iran. And secondly, it is costly, I think, with our allies.

MacNEIL: You mean that the psychological effect of that, even if, as the President said, the arms were defensive and could not make a difference in the war, the psychological effect would be as you described.

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: Well, it's not only psychological; it's also political. We, in effect, ar ehelping to pierce the defense embargo that we ourselves imposed on Iran. And that is bound to have an impact on the attitude of other governments of the world arms merchants, and it certainly will have an impact on the attitude of the Arab governments which feel threatened by the wave of Islamic fundamentalism originating from Iran. So in the region it's damaging. Secondly, in my judgement, it's also damaging towards our allies. After all, we have been urging them not to deal with terrorist states, to maintain a firm position. And clearly, our own conduct has not been consistent with our proclaimed rhetoric.

MacNEIL: You said also too risky.

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: Too risky, particularly in regards to the negotiations in Tehran. I have the highest respect for my successor, Bud McFarlane, and I admire his courage in going to Tehran. But in sending a former national security adviser to Tehran to some uncertain and apparently undefined encounter which, in effect, was aborted and without advance certainty that at least some of our key objectives would be achieved, I think was risky in terms of the individuals involved and in terms of the stakes involved. I feel that such an action should not have been undertaken unless we have some advance assurance that either the hostages will be released or that there will be some significant turn in the American-Iranian relationship.

MacNEIL: Some people are saying that it just simply isn't realistic to expect reliable deals with any supposedly moderate faction in Iran. What is your experience?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI: Well, I must say that there is something to that. When we were trying to resolve the hostage issue, when the American hostages were held in the embassy in Tehran, we had some dealings with some Iranians. The foreign minister of Iran at the time negotiated through intermediaries with us with the then Chief of Staff -- domestic Chief of Staff -- Hamilton Jordan involved in that operation. And I must say, throughout the effort, I was somewhat skeptical, because I felt that when the bottom line comes to be written, the Iranians simply would not deliver because of internal divisions. And I rather suspect that this is what happened in this case, and we should have probably known better. Though I say this with hesitation, because I know the intentions were good and the stakes were high. But again, I have to say that I think the

2022287528 7

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

RICK ANDERSON, Seattle Times: Every step like this reduces the attractiveness, the attraction of smoking. Every step like this adds to the sort of psychic costs of the habit.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: By discouraging employees from smoking, theSeattle Times says it's saving on health care costs, though it doesn't yet know how much. Its smoking policy does help it retain its preferred status on property casualty insurance, and that saves the paper upwards of $200,000 a year.

Therapist: How bad is it?

Smoker: It's awful. Disgusting.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: The benefits to employers are so great that many of them are spending thousands of dollars to help their employees kick the habit. They're employing the whole gamut of treatment programs: hypnosis, psychoanalysis and, here at the Schick Center in Seattle, aversion therapy. In this program, a smoker is shut into a dirty, smoky, little booth. Electrodes clipped to an arm deliver electric shocks as the smoker is required to quick-puff cigarettes until her mouth is uncomfortably hot. It's all intended to associate smoking with unpleasant sensations, so the smoking employee loses the craving to smoke.

Therapist: Is the impulse on your arm strong enough? Is it irritating?

Smoker: I probably could use it a little higher.

Therapist: Okay.

HOCHBERG {voice-over}: More than 20 companies around Seattle are putting employees through the program at $345 per person. In just one year, corporations have paid Schick $130,000 to get their employees off smoking. And, bizarre as the treatment may be, Schick says more and more employees are lining up to take it. That may be the most surprising part of this anti-smoking trend -- how willing smokers have been to accept the no smoking policies; indeed, to take advantage of them to help them break the habit. It's an attitude that makes anti-smoking crusaders like Bill Weiss and Bob Rosner confident that smoke-free workplaces will soon be the rule; not the exception.

BILL WEISS, Smoking Policy Institute: The notion that there are a bunch of militant, you know, fist-pounding smokers out there screaming rights issues is a fallacious notion. That simply is not the case.

BOB ROSNER, Smoking Policy Institute: This is something that people are going to have to get used to -- that the ashtray in the corporate environment is going to be as rare as the spittoon is. Smoking is on its way out.

HUNTER-GAULT: And now a final look at the top stories of this Friday. President Reagan said the country will support his secret negotiations with Iran. There was more criticism from Congress over the President's decision to ship some weapons to Iran. And the United States imposed economic sanctions on Syria because of its links to terrorists. Good night, Robin.

MacNEIL: Good night, Charlayne. That's the News Hour tonight. We'll see you on Monday night. I'm Robert MacNeil. Good night.

2022875301

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

not giving up the SDI."

HUNTER-GAULT: All right. Well, we'll just have to wait and see. Thank you, Congressman Hyde and Congressman Aspin for being with us, and Suzanne Garment and Charles Krauthammer.

Second-Hand Smoke

MacNEIL: Finally tonight, a new report on smoking. Passive smoking, or the inhaling of other people's tobacco fumes came under sharp attack today by a blue ribbon panel of scientists. They concluded in a major study sponsored by the federal government that passive smoking causes health problems for young children and spouses of smokers. The results were released today at a Washington news conference.

We have reached three major conclusions: one, exposure to environmental tobacco smoke is clearly harmful to young children and infants by increasing the risk of respiratory illnesses; two, passive smoking increases the risk of lung cancer in nonsmokers married to smokers; and three, passive smoking causes very real acute effects in many nonsmokers, largely through irritation of the eyes, nose and throat, and annoyance at the persistent odor.

MacNEIL: Today's report is bound to fuel the ongoing battle between smokers and nonsmokers, and it will undoubtedly lead to renewed calls to ban smoking from the workplace. One such battle is being fought in Washington State. For more on that story, we have a report originally broadcast in September from Lee Hochberg of public station KCTS, Seattle.

LEE HOCHBERG (voice-over): On an average workday in Seattle, white collar workers cluster on the sidewalk, forced out of their offices to light up -- outside insurance companies and hospitals and television stations.

Smoker: I don't mind. It's cut down my smoking.

HOCHBERG: It has cut down your smoking.

Smoker: Cut it in half.

Smoker: I don't think it's a very professional look for the company to have people huddled around smoking outside. I think it's very juvenile, actually. Reminiscent of high school days.

HOCHBERG: What if they forced you outside to smoke?

Smoker: Somehow or another, that never has seemed to me to be constitutional. It's a legal activity. It's not illegal.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): That's the position of the tobacco industry, as suggested by a spokeswoman on a recent Seattle television program.

(clip from NightSight)

ANN BROWDER, The Tobacco Institute: We're saying it's a legal and lawful product, and anyone who chooses to use the product should be able to use the product. That's all that we're saying. We're saying that there should be

2022287529

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

MacNEIL: Usually, we run our essays at the end of the program. But tonight's is so pertinent to the discussion, we decided to let it play in. This is Roger Rosenblatt's analysis of why the President undertook secret dealings with Iran.

ROGER ROSENBLATT: Some shock has followed Ronald Reagan's apparent blunder in dealing arms to Iran to free U.S. hostages in Lebanon. How could a President with an uncanny grasp of the public mind go off so deep an end so suddenly? In fact, the effort to free individuals at a possible extreme cost is perfectly consistent with the way Reagan has always conducted the President's business. In forests of complex issues, Reagan likes to point to the trees, to individuals. Think back to all you know of Ronald Reagan, and there is always some other person in the picture. Originally, that person was you, the individual tree he addressed with startling success in the 1980 Presidential debates.

Pres. REAGAN: Are you better off than you were four years ago?

ROSENBLATT: In the six years since, you have remained preeminent in the President's vision. It is still you he addresses in weekly radio broadcasts and in television appearances, as he did when he tried to put the best face on the Iran negotiation.

Pres. REAGAN: I ask for your support, because I believe you share the hope for peace in the Middle East, for freedom for all hostages, and for a world free of terrorism.

ROSENBLATT: Britain is America's ally. But in Reagan, that abstract agreement is brought to life by personification -- by the friendship and ideological comradeship of Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. Libya is America's enemy. But that enmity glowers as a private hostility between Reagan and Khadafy. If free enterprise needs commending, Reagan will shed his spotlight on a Mother Hale of Harlem, as he did in the 1985 State of the Union speech, and elevate one woman to an entire economic theory. If a war is to be honored, a single veteran will stand beside the President, creating a tableau that speaks, if imprecisely, for itself.

Whatever sense one can make of the Iran deal may be traced to Reagan's microcosmic vision. Yet, that vision seems emotional; not rational. Reagan sees the world as individuals, because individuals embody feelings that stir his own. In the case at hand, he apparently felt for the plight of the bostages, and those feelings took precedence over his nation's stated policy of not trading with terrorists, over using accepted channels for intelligence operations, over our declared neutrality in the Iran-Iraqi war.

In recent incidents involving Nicholas Daniloff and the summit meeting in Iceland, Reagan also focused on individual feelings. Daniloff's imprisonment spurred Reagan to solve that problem alone, and not the problems that accrue to it. In Reykjavik, he tried to charm Gorbachev the man, mindless of the fact that Gorbachev is also a system. With Daniloff and Gorbachev, Reagan's luck, not his vision, prevailed. With Iran, both his luck and his vision may have run dry.

To a point, Americans will tolerate, even applaud, a President's leapfrogging of rules and restrictions, as long as they perceive a worthwhile goal

2022875293

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

HUNTER-GAULT: Congressman Hyde, what do you think about that? How severely do you think the administration's policies abroad are damaged by this incident?

Rep. HYDE: Let me say something in response to Mr. Krauthammer. I don't think we needed Bud McFarlane to risk his life for four days in Tehran and other overtures, if this was a primitive hostage swap. That could have been arranged at the U.N. without all of this cloak and dagger stuff.

HUNTER-GAULT: Well, let me just get him to --

Rep. HYDE: There's much more than a primitive hostage swap, and the strategic initiative has been going on for 18 months. It has to do with a lot of issues beyond the hostages. And I think it's a gross oversimplification that is born out of not being familiar with the people involved, nor being briefed by the right people, to make that, I think, superficial conclusion.

HUNTER-GAULT: You want to respond to that?

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Well, I find it hard to believe that Mr. Hyde is arguing what really went on here was a grand strategic design. There's a report that this policy began in July of last year, after we realized that the Iranians had helped in the release of a few of the TWA hostages. Which would indicate that even at the origin there was an understanding that this was an avenue to releasing hostages.

Rep. HYDE: But this was --

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: And in fact, it may be true that there was no need to send McFarlane to Tehran to negotiate a primitive hostage deal, but that's in fact what happened.

Rep. HYDE: Well, you say it happened. Mr. McFarlane doesn't say that happened.

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Well, we had a hostage released, and we haven't had a great strategic realignment.

Rep. HYDE: Well, in addition to that -- I just disagree, and I think the facts don't support Mr. Krauthammer's position. Superficially, they do. As to our allies, let me say this: a moderate Iran would be a boon to all of our allies, including Saudi Arabia, including Egypt, including Kuwait, including Britain and France. And if our initiatives, if our negotiations can elevate a faction within Iran which does exist and which is weary of the war and seeing their 14 year old kids mowed down at the front, which is fearful of a Soviet incursion similar to Afghanistan and which is against terrorism, we would be crazy and derelict in our duty not to pursue that, and that's what the President has done. It's risky, but it was worth the risk, as Suzanne Garment said.

HUNTER-GAULT: Congressman Aspin, let me just ask you, how severely damaged do you think the administration is abroad, and if, in fact, you think that the criticism now is aimed at further weakening the President.

Rep. ASPIN: I think he is damaged, and I think that Charles Krauthammer is more right than wrong. Although I think that the distinction here is not a clear cut one. It isn't just was it geopolitical or was it hostages. I'm

2022875297

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000

(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, November 14, 1986

achieved. But their tolerance will go quickly of they feel that Presidential self-assurance is giving way to recklessness. In the matter of Iran, it is hard to argue that a few lives now are worth what may be perpetual incentives for terror. In a way, the American people asked for what they got in this incident, by always having treated Reagan exactly as he always has treated the people. If Reagan has zeroed in on individual members of the republic to make his points, the republic has also zeroed in on and favored Reagan as a man. Not the office, but the individual has garnered an attitude of all embracing trust. Yet, the country values principles as well as lives. And it remains a question whether the sight of a few freed hostages smiling warmly at the President's side will relieve the criticism that Reagan overlooked the forest for the trees.

MacNEIL: Sometimes in Washington, the words of columnists in major newspapers give clues to public officials in shaping debates. That certainly has been the case in the Iran imbroglio, and two of the shapers are with us now. Charles Krauthammer is senior editor of the New Republic and a syndicated columnist. Suzanne Garment is a columnist with the Wall Street Journal.

Starting with you, Charles Krauthammer, what is your comment on Roger Rosenblatt's view of this?

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER, New Republic: Well, I think he focused correctly on what the problem is, which was an obsessive and excessive focus by the President on individuals. And I think it resulted in a disaster -- a political disaster.

MacNEIL: Suzanne Garment, what's your view of it?

SUZANNE GARMENT, Wall Street Journal: From what I've been able to learn so far, the major objective was the opening to Iran.

MacNEIL: In other words, you agree with some of the previous speakers -- Mr. Brzezinski and the two congressmen -- that the geopolitical motive was uppermost, and the hostage question secondary.

Ms. GARMENT: That is the burden of the evidence so far.

MacNEIL: And you don't agree with that, Charles Krauthammer.

Mr. KRAUTHAMMER: Well, I think whenever people are in a tight spot in Washington, they use the word strategic, and that makes them a geopolitician. It seems to me, in this case, the question of motives is irrelevant. The question is, what happened? And what happened was an obvious swap. This morning, Don Regan was asked on one of the news shows if this was a swap. And his response was to rhetorically ask about Daniloff, was that a swap or was it not, as if it's still an open question. In this case, it's not an open question. And I think it was a disaster for the United States to jeopardize its interest in the Middle East with the moderate Arabs and its standing in Europe on this issue over individuals.

MacNEIL: Ms. Garment, what's your comment?

Ms. GARMENT: You know, if some hostages get freed in the course of a negotiation like this, I, for one, don't mind at all. The question, to my mind, is the question of what principle is, in the main, governing the actions of the U.S. administration. And as far as I can tell, it was the strategic

2022875294

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lrmx0000